

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are seven (7) sheets of corrected formal drawings. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

In Figs. 5a-5g, the shading has been modified as requested by the Examiner.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

Attachments: Seven (7) Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are now present in the application. The specification, drawings, and claims 1-3, 7, 9-10 and 16 have been amended. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84. Applicants have submitted seven (7) sheets of corrected formal drawings and cancelled claims 4 and 11 to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 has been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-3, 7, 10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections have been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims now comply with the enablement requirement and are definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pellegrino, (U.S. Patent No. 6,149,441). Claims 5, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellegrino in view of Bunting, (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,843). Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellegrino in view of Bunting, and further in view of Linton, (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,404). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended

Independent claim 1 now recites “a course scheduling module, which receives course selection information from student and appointment with lecturing faculty, *transmits selected course and faculty to the online faculty for conflict verification, then transmits said verification result back to said student*”.

Independent claim 9 now recites “authenticate online members, verify faculty and student’s identify”, “displaying faculty member list and all course information”, “choosing course and lecturing faculty by the student according to lesson plan and schedules courses”, *“sending said course schedule to the online faculty which the student chosen”*, *“verifying said course schedule, and returning verification result to the student, if there is conflict in verification result, it reminds student to restart course scheduling”*, “according to said course schedule and said verification result, executing an online learning activity and evaluating a learning grade”, and “collecting statistics and calculate said learning grade and displaying result to said student.”

As disclosed on page 2, lines 10-15 of the specification, “[f]acing the development of interconnecting network, combined with the current development of the educational profession, to efficiently take advantage of the data resources in the interconnecting network for educational and scientific research purposes, the online resources can be fully utilized. This, to efficiently manage and service students scattered around the globe by using Internet technology to combine the unique service ability of the Internet with education purpose. These are topics that have been researched continuously.”

The present invention provides a system and method to combine learning and academic affairs, to provide non-stop service, to utilize the vast information on the Internet, to easily retrieve and save, and to interact instantaneous learning and academic affairs managing with no time and space limitation. Students can choose the desired course content and lecturing faculty at anytime, anywhere, and can inquire about a learning grade in real-time.

As the Examiner has correctly acknowledged, Pellegrino did not disclose or teach anything about *“conflict”* as recited in claims 1 and 9. However, the Examiner alleged that

Bunting in col. 7, lines 15-25 discloses the conflict of the claimed invention and therefore cures the deficiencies of Pellegrino. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Bunting in col. 7, lines 15-25 discloses:

Wherein a conflict exists, the user is warned about the conflict (step 950) and asked whether they wish to still schedule the event (step 955). Wherein the user indicates that they still wish to schedule the event, the event is scheduled in the calendar (step 960). Wherein the user does not wish to schedule the event, step 960 is bypassed. Steps 930-960 are then repeated until the user indicates that they have completed scheduling events during step 935. When the user indicates that they are finished scheduling events during step 935, the user exits the calendar (step 965) and the calendar scheduling is completed.

In other words, Bunting merely discloses the conflict in the student side (the user side). Unlike Bunting, the conflict of the present invention is for both students and faculty sides. Bunting merely discloses the conflict in the student side (the user side), but fails to disclose the conflict in the faculty side as recited in claims 1 and 9.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on the other secondary references, these references also fail to disclose the above combinations of elements as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Pellegrino.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 9 or their dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Seven (7) Replacement sheets